

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>SACV 11-0485 AG (AJWx)</b>	Date	June 12, 2012
Title	LISA LIBERI, et al. v. ORLY TAITZ, et al.		

---

Present: The Honorable	ANDREW J. GUILFORD
---------------------------	--------------------

---

Lisa Bredahl

Not Present

---

Deputy Clerk

---

Court Reporter / Recorder

---

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

**Proceedings: [IN CHAMBERS] ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFFS'  
LETTER REQUEST SEEKING LEAVE TO AMEND**

At the end of 2011, Plaintiffs filed a request for leave to file a motion to amend the First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), seeking to reduce the size of the FAC. The Court denied the request, stating:

Any such amendments should have been made long ago. This case has been pending since May 2009. Trial is fast approaching in June 2012, and there is at least one pending Motion to Dismiss based on the current First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), as well as eight filed Answers. While the FAC is unwieldy, the Court has already ruled that it is not per se deficient. The Court finds that filing a Second Amended Complaint at this late date would delay rather than promote the efficient resolution of this case.

Plaintiffs now, once again, seek leave to amend the FAC. On June 6, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a Request ("Request") for Leave to File a Motion to Amend the First Amended Complaint, seeking to join IRBSearch, LLC, and to reduce the size of the FAC.

The Court repeats its previous finding: any such amendments should have been made

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>SACV 11-0485 AG (AJWx)</b>	Date	June 12, 2012
Title	LISA LIBERI, et al. v. ORLY TAITZ, et al.		

long ago. This case has been pending since May 2009, giving Plaintiffs ample time to conduct discovery, bring any motions to compel, and reduce the size of their operative complaint if necessary. Plaintiffs argue that the Court's May 22, 2012 Order provides an adequate basis for Plaintiffs' request. The Court disagrees, particularly given the long pendency of this action, and other considerations. (*See* Dkt. No. 227) (standing order, entered at Plaintiffs' request, requires a showing of "good cause" for leave to file any motions in this case).

The Court DENIES the Request.

\_\_\_\_\_ : 0

Initials of  
Preparer                      lmb